

New England Journal of Public Policy

Volume 29 | Issue 1

Article 14

3-20-2017

Inclusiveness, Foresight, and Decisiveness: The Practical Wisdom of Barrier-Crossing Leaders

Michael A. Cowan

Loyola University, mcowan@loyno.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholarworks.umb.edu/nejpp>



Part of the [International Relations Commons](#), [Peace and Conflict Studies Commons](#), and the [Public Policy Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Cowan, Michael A. (2017) "Inclusiveness, Foresight, and Decisiveness: The Practical Wisdom of Barrier-Crossing Leaders," *New England Journal of Public Policy*: Vol. 29 : Iss. 1 , Article 14.

Available at: <http://scholarworks.umb.edu/nejpp/vol29/iss1/14>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by ScholarWorks at UMass Boston. It has been accepted for inclusion in New England Journal of Public Policy by an authorized editor of ScholarWorks at UMass Boston. For more information, please contact library.uasc@umb.edu.

Inclusiveness, Foresight, and Decisiveness: The Practical Wisdom of Barrier-Crossing Leaders

Michael A. Cowan
Loyola University

This article previews a study under way to compare and contrast the attitudes, thinking, and action of leaders around the world who manage to bridge social divisions in their respective locales with those who work within their own groups. After briefly describing the planned assessment of their forms of social cohesion and empathy, the article examines the practical wisdom of effective actors in the social world and how it contrasts with academic knowledge for insight into how wise practitioners think about what they are doing. It also looks at the history of the conception of practical wisdom. Finally, examples of practical wisdom derived from one divided community in a time of crisis are offered.

Bo Rothstein defines a social trap as a situation where individuals, groups, or organizations are unable to cooperate because of mutual distrust and lack of social capital, even where cooperation would benefit all. Examples include civil strife, pervasive corruption, ethnic discrimination, depletion of natural resources, and misuse of social insurance systems.¹ In a social trap, even though all sides would benefit from cooperating, a history of mutual antagonism leaves them without sufficient trust to do so. This trust deficit sets limits on how much a divided community can develop, to the detriment of all groups belonging to it. These divisions typically play out along lines of race, class, religion, ethnicity, and nationality, which create barriers between groups and between whole communities and better futures. They are closely correlated with distributions of power in particular settings. Some social traps are high intensity, such as those threatening to engulf the Middle East; others are of lesser intensity, such as chronic racial tensions in the urban United States and sectarian divisions in Northern Ireland. Barrier-crossing leaders move against the divisive inertia of social traps.

The author is leading a study to identify leaders around the world who have broken through social traps in divided communities and those who choose to work within their own groups. The study seeks to understand how these leaders relate to members of their own and other groups and capture how they think about what works and what does not in the face of such impasses.

The Barrier-Crossing Leaders Survey will be administered to a group of civil society, business, and government leaders in a variety of settings. Confederates have been identified who will identify participants in the United States in Boston, Chicago, Los Angeles, New Orleans, New York, Minneapolis, St. Paul, Birmingham, and San Antonio, and internationally in Argentina, Bolivia, Egypt, El Salvador, France, Ireland, England, Germany, Mexico, Northern Ireland, Singapore, and South Korea.

Michael Cowan is a professor in the Institute for Ministry, Loyola University, New Orleans; senior fellow in the Centre for the Resolution of Intractable Conflict, Harris Manchester College, University of Oxford; and visiting research associate, Irish School of Ecumenics, Confederal School of Religion, Peace Studies, and Theology, Trinity College, Dublin.

The confederates will recruit participants, arrange to have materials translated into respondents' first languages where necessary, and oversee responses in on-line format where possible or in written form if not.

Quantitative findings on collective identification, identity fusion, and trait and situated empathy and qualitative analysis of recurring and idiosyncratic themes in the practical reasoning of respondents will be carried out and summarized. The principal investigator will disseminate each group's results and cumulative results of all groups for purposes of comparison to the various locales through their respective confederates. He will also distill recommendations for civil society, government, and philanthropic organizations in the study's locations and elsewhere on how to generalize social trust in local communities by developing barrier-crossing leaders.

After a brief description of how in- and out-group relations will be assessed, this article considers what kind of thinking allows some people to bridge racial and other divides.

Relational Assessments: Social Cohesion and Empathy

The study's co-investigators, Harvey Whitehouse and Michael Buhrmester, describe one part of its assessment as follows:

Barrier-crossing leaders play a critical role in healing and strengthening communities. Leaders can be found in every nation tackling a diverse array of complex issues. Here, we seek to explore whether there are universal qualities that most barrier-crossing leaders share as well as the qualities that make so many leaders unique. There are many qualities relevant to leadership in inter-group conflicts, but here we focused on just a few that past researchers have identified as quite important. In this study we are looking at two contrasting forms of social cohesion: collective identification and identity fusion. *Collective identification* involves perceiving a connection between the group in the abstract and oneself, based primarily on shared beliefs, values, norms, etc. *Identity fusion*, in contrast, involves feeling a visceral sense of oneness with a group and its members in such a way that the group feels like family. Recent research suggests that people who feel strongly fused to a group are especially likely to engage in acts of altruism for the group. Past research also suggests that feeling totally fused to a group is a relatively rare phenomenon, at least rarer than feeling strong collective identification. Thus, one goal of our project is to explore whether leaders tend to score highly on one or both of these forms of cohesion. A second goal is to examine whether leaders' levels of cohesion to different communities is strongly or weakly associated with the other variables in the survey. For instance, the survey contains a number of questions tapping two kinds of empathy toward particular communities. *Trait empathy* refers to one's general level of empathic concern and perspective across all situations, whereas *situated empathy* refers to empathic feelings tied to specific communities. Past research suggests that many people who are highly fused to one and only one community tend to have especially strong situated empathy only for their community but little empathy for anyone outside their community. Here, we seek to explore whether barrier-crossing leaders buck this trend and exhibit strong cross-group cohesion as well cross-group empathy. We also seek to explore the antecedent processes that lead to high levels of cohesion. Past work suggests that single, highly intense events shared with group

members, especially dysphoric events, can lead to the development of fusion quickly. Several survey questions ask about key aspects of these kinds of events.²

One aspect of the study, then, is assessing quantitatively what forms the cohesion between community leaders and their own and other groups take, as well as their capacity to empathize with members of their own and other groups.

The Practical Understanding of Wise Practitioners

The second aspect of the study, the one examined here, is an attempt to comprehend how leaders who manage to cross the formidable divides called social traps understand what they are doing, by retrieving the classic description of the philosopher who gave Western culture its map of how human beings know our world.

In the *Nicomachean Ethics* Aristotle famously identifies three forms of knowing—the philosopher’s or *theoria*, the builder’s or *poesis*, and the wise actor’s or *phronesis*. The character of *phronesis*, long translated in English as prudence and more recently as practical wisdom, may be cited initially by contrasting it with *theoria*, the form of knowledge that we associate with experts. The theoretician knows what science and logic have to say on a subject, the state of current intellectual understanding of it. The wise practitioner knows how to do something that makes a difference in the social or political world. In Aristotle’s words: “Prudence is not concerned with the universals alone but must also be acquainted with the particulars: it is bound up with action, and action concerns the particulars. Hence even some who are without *theoria*, those who have *phronesis*, are more skilled in acting than are others who do have *theoria*.³ *Theoria* is about knowing, not doing. *Phronesis* is the kind of knowing based in experience that makes it possible to act well. It is knowing for the sake of doing.

The difference between practical and theoretical knowledge is the difference in thinking and acting between a seasoned, effective community leader who knows nothing of the theory of community leadership and an academician who knows the theory but has not been, and perhaps could not be, a community leader. Good coaches, teachers, pastors, mayors, parents, mediators, counselors, and community leaders are practitioners whose actions are shaped by practical wisdom. They think about things but are not thinkers in the usual sense of the term. They think about things such as the differing interests that are at play in situations, the likely reactions to possible actions, and the feasibility and values of possible outcomes. They are thoughtful doers.

Robert Hariman delves more deeply into the character of *phronesis*, identifying three constitutive dimensions. First, practically wise actors accommodate competing perspectives, priorities, and values within their own group and others. Practical wisdom is inclusive. Hariman writes: “Plurality refers to the condition of having multiple, autonomous, and often competing values pertinent to the decision.”⁴ He argues that engaging with plurality is an inherently political action: “Politics is essentially the process that emerges when people have to negotiate a radical plurality of goods.”⁵ One iconic description of the ongoing political experiment called the United States is *E pluribus unum*—From many one. A diverse group of peoples becoming a whole requires creating a *polis* with room for the many. And this outcome is never achieved once and for all; rather, it is constantly tested by the effort of some groups to assert new influence within the one and by the steady arrival of new others seeking admittance. In embracing differences in taking practical action, human beings develop the virtue of *inclusiveness*.

Second, practical wisdom accepts the impossibility of predicting exactly what will happen in the world as it is while continually estimating the likely consequences of possible actions. Hariman

writes: “Contingency refers to the inevitable unpredictability of the human world because of the complexity created by desire, chance, and the high degree of interdependence among all the variables affecting action.”⁶ In the midst of unpredictable complexity, practical wisdom requires calculation. A famous Saul Alinsky aphorism is pertinent here: “The action is in the inevitable reaction.”⁷ He meant that in taking action, what matters principally is not what we do but what others do in response. In her classic work *The Human Condition*, Hannah Arendt characterizes the effects of human actions as unpredictable and irreversible.⁸ We cannot know in advance what the ramifications of our actions will be and we cannot undo an action once we have taken it. But in learning to identify in advance and weigh possible outcomes of our actions as part of deciding what to do, and to get better at calculating likely outcomes in the future by developing the habit of evaluating the effects that actually occur when we do act, human beings develop the virtue of *foresight*.

Third, practical wisdom moves people from deliberation to action. Hariman writes: “Prudence exists in order to address action; prudence is more capable [than the other forms of knowledge] of commanding action; prudence is validated by action.”⁹ Practical wisdom is not just about inclusiveness and calculating likely outcomes, it culminates in action and careful evaluation of the actual effects of those actions after the fact. Practical wisdom is about performance. In order to act well, wise practitioners must hold action together with inclusiveness and calculation, and this is what skilled actors learn to do. In learning to act inclusively and learn from the outcomes, human beings develop the virtue of *decisiveness*.

Poor decisions in the world as it is result not only when one or more of the dimensions of practical wisdom is missing but when good enough balance among the three is absent. Too much concern with being inclusive leads to giving up the possibility of actually doing something in exchange for having everyone at the table, while too little inclusion produces plans and proposals with insufficient legitimacy in the larger community to be transformative. Too much calculation leads to being paralyzed by the complexity of the world as it is, the world in which we must act, while too little calculation leads to wishful thinking and lack of feasible plans. Too much focus on action can lead to losing sight of why we are acting and getting caught up in public performances, acting for the sake of action, while too little action turns groups into places where talk never leads to action and motivation to participate dissipates.

Tension among these three dimensions is inevitable. It can be creative or paralyzing. Paying attention to inclusiveness gives a group more perspectives from which to calculate likely outcomes and arrive at decisions that can lead to effective action. Developing the capacity to calculate outcomes effectively helps a group to create agendas for action not limited to the concerns of one group and hold its decisions to standards of feasibility and effectiveness. Learning to decide and act together strengthens bonds among members of a diverse group and creates the impetus for careful collective evaluation of whether intended outcomes were achieved and why (or why not).

For purposes of analysis the three faces of practical wisdom may be separately identified and described, as I have done here, but in life they intermingle and intermediate, balancing and rebalancing each other as partners, interests, opponents, and circumstances change. Single-minded fidelity solely to a set of values or principles feeds an unwillingness to contaminate oneself by involvement in the inevitable ethical messiness of public life. Concern only for effective action encourages an unprincipled pragmatism; in focusing too narrowly on what we will do, we lose the motivational grounding of why we do it. Ethical practical actors learn to hold what they regard as good and as possible, the faithfulness and feasibility of their options, in creative tension, to accept

half a loaf when that is all that is possible, and to move along to the next challenge. In the world as it is, ethical action is always possible, but perfection is not an option.

Practical Wisdom in Action: A Brief Analytic Narrative

From the outset of the American Civil War, one pillar of Abraham Lincoln's strategy was to ensure that the slave-holding border states of Delaware, Maryland, Kentucky, and Missouri did not join the Confederacy. Under enormous pressure from the moment of his election from religious leaders pressing for the immediate abolition of slavery, Lincoln, legend has it, said: "I hope to have God on our side, but I must have Kentucky." Lincoln's judgment about of the gravity of the matter appears plainly in a letter he wrote to Orville Browning on September 22, 1861: "I think to lose Kentucky is nearly the same as to lose the whole game. Kentucky gone, we cannot hold Missouri, nor, as I think, Maryland. These all against us, and the job on our hands is too large for us. We would as well consent to separation at once, including the surrender of this capitol."¹⁰ President Lincoln considered the neutrality of the border states, especially Kentucky, essential to the preservation of the Union and the ultimate extinction of the institution of slavery.

As I noted earlier, practical wisdom deals with particular circumstances. What was the factual basis for Lincoln's concern? First, demographics. The white population of the Confederate states was 5.5 million; the population of the Union states was 18.5 million; the white population of the border states as the Civil War begins was 2.5 million. Should the border states join the Confederacy, its white population would increase by nearly 30 percent to 8 million. If the enslaved populations are included in the calculation, the population of an expanded Confederacy would have increased to 12 million.

Second, geography. Three of the four border states presented particular hazards to the Union cause. Maryland surrounded the Union capital, Washington, DC, on three sides. Losing Maryland would mean surrendering the nation's capital, a loss so demoralizing as possibly to lead to the Union's capitulation to the permanent separation of North and South. Kentucky provided the main line of geographic defense for Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois. It also controlled access to important river systems. Missouri was a major producer of grain and livestock. Its defection to the Confederacy would expose Iowa, Kansas, and Illinois and make it hard for Union forces to control Kentucky and the Mississippi River.

Third, politics. All the border states but Delaware had strong secessionist movements. These exerted constant local pressure on state political leaders to protect slavery by severing ties with the Union and joining the Confederacy. No politician seeking office could afford to ignore the possible costs of resisting these influences.

These are the hard demographic, geographic, and political facts that according to legend led Lincoln to say: "I hope to have God on our side, but I must have Kentucky." To ensure that he would have Kentucky, he took two practical steps. He refused to abolish slavery immediately, waiting instead for a moment when doing so could be justified as military necessity. And he refrained from ordering the border states to contribute soldiers to the Union army.

In the most tragic and compelling circumstances, we hear the voice of practical wisdom—I must have Kentucky—responding to the absolute idealism of the abolitionists. Guided by this practical compass, President Lincoln sought a way between ideological purity and unchecked pragmatism, with thousands of lives, the future of the demonic institution of slavery, and the fate of a nation hanging in the balance to a degree that it had not since the Revolution and has not since. In the end, because of Lincoln's decisions, Kentucky and the other border states remained neutral, the Union endured, and the great evil of slavery was abolished. To everything there is a season,

and a time for every purpose under heaven. Being able to judge when the time is right is a hallmark of *phronesis*. Lincoln's practical wisdom saved the Union and made its original sin unconstitutional. At moments of practical decision, there are no guarantees that even our wisest choices will lead to the outcomes for which we hope, but act we must, nonetheless, or surrender to events.

We can discern in this narrative the three dimensions of practical wisdom outlined in the previous section: inclusiveness, foresight, and decisiveness. In the persons of the border-state leaders, the abolitionists, and members of other coalitions within the Union, Lincoln found himself faced with multiple, autonomous, and often competing values pertinent to the decision. For the abolitionists, the only thing that mattered was abolishing slavery immediately. For leaders of the border states, what mattered above all was not having slavery disrupted within their boundaries. For Lincoln, preserving the Union remained throughout the ultimate concern. To do so, he had to take into account and as far as possible include the interests of all three positions in his policy-making decisions. This is a classic, complex example of perspectives and priorities in conflict. A wise decision had to be not only principled and shrewd but also inclusive.

The story exemplifies the inevitable unpredictability of the human world because of the complexity created by desire, chance, and the high degree of interdependence among all the variables affecting action. Neither abolitionists nor border state leaders nor President Lincoln could predict with certainty what would happen if he attempted to abolish slavery at that moment, or if he did not. Each could calculate the likely consequences of the two decisions based only on what they knew and believed. A particular decision was being urged on the president in the midst of the most violent war the world had seen; neither the urgers nor the urged could see clearly what would happen whatever he decided. The abolitionists were so focused on ending the evils of slavery immediately that no possible other effects of freeing the slaves—including the possible loss of the Civil War, the destruction of the Union, and even extending slavery's future indefinitely—tempered their moral passion. As the chief presiding officer of the United States, however, Lincoln, despite his publicly expressed desire to see the institution of slavery abolished, could not afford the luxury of an ethics of abstract purity. Rather, he was morally responsible for calculating the likely consequences of any decision he made. A wise decision required careful calculation of possible outcomes. His was an ethics of responsibility.¹¹

Lincoln had to act, either to declare slavery abolished immediately on ethical grounds or refuse to do so at that moment for a pragmatic reason, to keep the border states neutral as one means of holding the union together. In the arena of public life, after we have been as inclusive as possible without losing the capacity to act effectively, and after we have calculated likely outcomes as best we can, we must act. Practical wisdom "exists in order to address action; prudence is more capable [than the other forms of knowledge] of commanding action; prudence is validated by action." In this instance a wise presidential decision would lead to feasible actions aimed at preserving the Union and to the ultimate extinction of slavery.

Practically wise leaders, then, know how to embrace differences, deal with complexity and unpredictability, and move a group from deliberation to action. The survey to be used in this study features questions aimed at assessing each of these dimensions of practical wisdom in the thinking of community leaders. It also seeks to understand what motivated respondents to try breaking through a social trap or to work within their own groups, what they have learned in a practical way about building barrier-crossing partnerships, and what advice they would offer to others about overcoming social traps.

Ancient Roots of the Concept of Practical Wisdom

Western law and morality, its sense of the world as it should be, derive from the Bible, especially the Ten Commandments, and Greek thought. Aristotle's classic formulation of *phronesis* in the *Nicomachean Ethics* was written in 350 B.C.E. Since all documents of the Christian New Testament were composed by Greek writers for Greek-speaking audiences nearly four hundred years later, we should not be surprised to find his vocabulary and, therefore, his worldview embedded in these biblical texts. After all, it had been circulating in the Greek-speaking world for almost four centuries. It might be surprising, however, to discover just how deeply embedded they are.

Of all the texts of Christian scripture, none has had larger effects on Christian self-understanding down through two millennia than the one popularly called the Sermon on the Mount. It is to be found in chapters 5–7 of the Gospel of Matthew. Nearly every classic teaching associated with Christianity may be found in these three chapters, including, but not limited to, the beatitudes, the Lord's prayer, being the light of the world and the salt of the earth, not storing up treasure on earth or casting your pearls before swine, the straight gate and the narrow way, knowing people by their fruits, and turning the other cheek. These three dense chapters end with a parable.

Everyone who hears these words of mine and acts on them will be like a **wise** man who built his house on rock. The rain fell, the floods came, and the winds blew and beat on that house, but it did not fall, because it had been founded on rock. And everyone who hears these words of mine and does not act on them will be like a foolish man who built his house on sand. The rain fell, and the floods came, and the winds blew and beat against that house, and it fell—and great was its fall!¹²

This parable is the interpretive key to the whole sermon, telling readers plainly what to do with what they have heard. *Phronein*, the Greek word translated as “wise” and printed in boldface in the preceding passage, is an adjectival form of the Greek noun *phronesis* (“prudence” or “practical wisdom”) that we have already met. The gospel's author tells his readers that the one who hears the words of the Sermon on the Mount and acts on them demonstrates the same kind of wisdom as the man who builds his house on a rock and can expect the same outcomes when the inevitable bad weather of life comes. This one little word points to the kind of knowledge the evangelist sees as required for authentic Christian existence: the common sense to build your house on rock not sand. This is not esoteric spiritual advice but rather quite concrete imagery conveying a kind of spiritual common sense.

There is another connection between practical wisdom and this text, a bit subtler but illuminating. As noted earlier, one of the characteristics of the practically wise person is the capacity to foster effective action. Such people are doers, practitioners of various activities. The text reads, “Everyone who hears these words of mine **and acts on them** will be like a wise man who builds his house on rock.” The sequence given is hear, then act. Not hearing means building my house on sand; not acting means the same. The one who both hears these words and acts on them builds his house on rock. The classic King James translation makes the point in the cadence of another time: “Whosoever heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them, I will liken him unto a wise man, which built his house upon a rock.” Wise practitioners not only hear the words of their moral and ethical traditions, they enact them in the real worlds in which they find themselves.

Aristotle's conception of practical wisdom has been embedded in Western vocabularies for more than twenty-three centuries, first in the Greek word *phronesis*, then the Latin word *prudentia*, then the English words *prudence* and *practical wisdom* and their counterparts in other languages. Aristotle's definition of practical wisdom affects our interpretations and actions because his vocabulary is part of our language. Like the evangelist who wrote the parable of the house built on rock, and the first communities to hear it, people today understand the difference between theory and practice, not because they have studied Aristotle, but because he helped form the language that makes possible and limits their interpretations and actions.

Practical Wisdom from the Crucible of Disaster

Following the devastation wreaked on New Orleans by Hurricane Katrina in 2005, the author organized a diverse group of civil society leaders under the title Common Good. The organization's vision was caught in five words: Many dreams. One New Orleans. Its members used their relationships to take seats along with business and government leaders at public tables where the rebuilding and transformation of a devastated city, 80 percent of which had been flooded, was being planned. In the more than ten years since those deliberations began, Common Good has been the lead organization in implementing major ethics reform to reduce legendary corruption and waste in the city government of New Orleans and has exercised significant leadership in systemic criminal justice reform as a founding member organization of the New Orleans Crime Coalition. In the process it helped to broaden and deepen a network of public relationships among civic, business, and government that created a new level of responsiveness and mutual accountability among leaders of the three sectors. That fortified social capital (or social trust) is now available to continue addressing ongoing social traps related to race and class in the city.

The five learnings that follow are examples of practical wisdom derived from action. Their historical context is New Orleans and what was then called the worst natural disaster in the history of the United States. Although like all instances of practical wisdom, their provenance is particular circumstances, they may speak to efforts to organize for social change in other times and places.

1. Change aimed at the common good requires recruiting and sustaining as diverse a group of partners as possible without giving up the capacity to act effectively together. Putting together such a group inevitably means not inviting some potential participants and recruiting others. In a democracy, everyone has a right to participate in social-action partnerships, but in reality, not everyone can do so constructively. Gathering as diverse a group as possible is a different task than bringing together a diverse group that can act together.

2. Focusing on a limited number of wisely chosen "whats" and exercising the shared discipline to hold that limited focus and adjust tactics until success is achieved, capacity grows, or circumstances change is a hallmark of effective social-action partnerships. Efforts at social change that try to do it all, or do too much, will accomplish little and inevitably unravel or become private social groups. Wise action decisions are almost always characterized by limited scope.

3. Mutual accountability is a requirement of effective social-action partnerships. It means that every specific task agreed to is someone's responsibility within a specified time and has an appropriate outcome indicator, and that partners hold each other accountable for commitments made. Accountability means acknowledging what was done well and what was not.

4. While often used interchangeably, *organization*, *coalition*, *alliance*, *movement*, and *network* actually name different ways of coming together to accomplish valued social outcomes, varying

forms of social-action partnerships. The challenge facing wise practitioners is to choose the form that fits current opportunities and challenges. Building an organization when an alliance would do is a waste of time, money and, more important, social capital; relying on a social network when a coalition is needed fails to deliver needed influence in a targeted, timely manner. What social vehicle to build is a pragmatic decision requiring, not theoretical or technical, but practical wisdom. Social-network approaches to action partnerships allow for informal, flexible coordination of all the other forms.

5. A powerful organizing strategy for changing a place for the good of all is organizing focused, sustained tri-sector action partnerships of government, business, and civic leaders within a flexible and open social-action network that can respond rapidly to constantly changing challenges and opportunities. Such a structure allows member organizations to pursue valued outcomes on their own steam as far as possible and engage others in partnership when more power is needed.

Learnings like these are not developed in the academy and then applied in society. They emerge from reflection on shared action by agents of change in the arena of public life and are tested and refined in the crucible of subsequent social action. They are the stuff of practical wisdom.

Closing: The Virtues of Practical Wisdom

In a world where divisions regularly appear to be intractable, we nonetheless find women and men of all races, creeds, ethnicities, nations, and classes attempting to cut through the inertial divisiveness of the social traps limiting the possible futures of members of their own and other groups as well as the larger communities—cities, regions, nations—to which they belong. The purpose of the study described here is to understand how people doing this heroic, bridge-building labor relate to members of their own and other groups, and what they have learned about what works and what does not, as well as the attitudes and actions of those who choose to work within their own group. The practical virtues of inclusiveness, foresight, and decisiveness that they have forged in the public arena light the way for other leaders facing other potential partners across other barriers. That is why their story matters.

Notes

¹ Bo Rothstein, *Social Traps and the Problem of Trust* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005).

² Michael Cowan, Harvey Whitehouse, and Michael Buhrmester, “Inclusiveness, Foresight, and Decisiveness” (unpublished manuscript, October 24, 2016).

³ Aristotle *Nicomachean Ethics*, translated by R. Bartlett and S. Collins (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2011), 124.

⁴ Robert Hariman, “Prudence in the Twenty-First Century,” in *Prudence*, ed. Hariman (University Park: Penn State University Press, 2003), 298.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 299.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 298.

⁷ Quoted in Edward T. Chambers, *Roots for Radicals* (New York: Continuum, 2003), 82.

⁸ Hannah Arendt, *The Human Condition*, 2nd. ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998), 236–47.

⁹ Hariman, “Prudence in the Twenty-First Century,” 298.

¹⁰ Don E. Fehrenbacher, *Abraham Lincoln: Speeches and Writings, 1859–1865* (New York: Literary Classics of America, 1989), 269.

¹¹ W. L. Miller *Lincoln's Virtues* (New York: Vintage, 2002), 192–97.

¹² Matthew 7:24–27 (New Revised Standard Version).